

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE

AND UNIVERSALIST MISCELLANY.

VOL. 4.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE." *Jesus Christ.*

NO. 18.

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1827.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

BY JOHN S. GREENE,

At No. 7, North Main-Street (third story.)

REV. DAVID PICKERING, EDITOR.

TERMS.—The Christian Telescope and Universalist Miscellany is published every Saturday morning, and printed on good paper, with new type, in quarto form of eight pages to each number, with a complete index at the close of the year; making in all old pages to the volume.

The paper will be sent to subscribers at \$3 per year; or \$1 if paid within six months from the time of subscribing.

To subscribers who receive their papers by express (not in the mail) an additional charge of 25 cts. will be made.

No subscriptions received for less than six months, and no paper discontinued till all arrearages are paid.

Subscribers who do not give notice of their wish to discontinue their papers, at least one month previous to the close of one volume, will be considered the subscribers for the next, and their bills presented accordingly.

Those who are, or may become agents for this paper, will be allowed 12 1-2 cents for every subscriber obtained by them, and 6 1-4 per cent for all monies remitted by them to the Publisher.

Miscellaneous.

HISTORY OF THE FELON'S SON.

Towards the end of the last century, a young man arrived at Marseilles on commercial affairs; he took up his abode at an inn, where he had been about three weeks, when he received a letter one evening, which obliged him to call immediately upon one of the principal merchants of the town. The merchant was out, and his wife saying that he was probably at the theatre, George (so our hero called himself) went thither to seek him. He entered the pit, and looked around in vain for the person he wanted; but as it was early, he thought that the merchant might still come, and he sat down to wait for him.

In a few minutes George heard the words, "Turn him out! turn him out!" uttered with great vehemence; and looking round to see whom they were addressing, he perceived they were intended for a youth of sickly appearance and very mild countenance, who sat near him.

"How is this?" cried George, turning to the person who sat next to him; "what has that boy done to be treated in such a manner?"

The person to whom he spoke was a man about fifty.

"Do you know him?" said he coldly.

"No—I never saw him before."

"Well, then, take a friend's advice, and don't meddle with the matter. The boy's name

is Tinville; he is the grandson of that monster, Fouquet Tinville."

At these words George recoiled with horror in his countenance.

"My good sir," said his neighbour, "I see that you agree with me, that there are names which always made honest people tremble."

George heaved a deep sigh.

"And yet," said he, after a moment's pause if the boy himself has done nothing bad, I don't think it just or generous to insult him: he is already unfortunate enough."

The noise had been suspended for an instant, but, as soon as he had uttered these words, the rioters recommenced their cries; the lad feigned not to perceive that he was the object of them, but his alarm was visible in his countenance. Encouraged by his timidity, one of the aggressors began to pull his coat, and another took him by the collar. George quickly rose.

"Stop a moment," said his neighbor catching hold of him, "don't you see they are ten to one?"

"Let them be twenty to two, then," cried he, indignantly; "I will never stand by tamely and see a helpless boy ill-used."

Breaking from the grasp of his prudent neighbor, he sprang lightly over the benches, and threw himself between the youth and his assailants—dealing, at the same time, some knock down blows to the right and left, and crying out.

"Cowards!—you call yourselves Frenchmen—and you are not ashamed to fall, ten of you upon one poor defenceless lad!"

The aggressors were young men, mostly in a state of intoxication, but yet not so far gone as to be insensible to shame.

"He says the truth," cried one.

"He is in the right," said another.

By degrees the group dispersed, those who had received the blows skulked away, and said nothing; the others excused themselves; and in a few minutes tranquility was restored. George took the youth by the arm, led him out of the theatre, and making a sign to a hackney coachman, hurried away without replying to Tinville's thanks and entreaties to know his name.

Three days afterwards, as he was passing through one of the principal streets, he felt himself seized by the skirt of his coat, and, looking around to see by whom, he perceived it was the gentleman whom he sat next to at the theatre.

"Heaven be praised! I have found you at last," cried he: "truly you have led me into a fine scrape."

"I sir! impossible!"

"No, no, it is possible enough. You must know that I have a brother, one of the principal bankers of Marseilles: every body speaks well of him but myself; and I say he is a crack-brained enthusiast. Why, sir, you have only to relate to him a trait of courage or generosity and he is ready to worship the hero of it. I told him the other night of the mad trick you played, and he flew to rage with me because I did not seize you and drag you to the house *vi et armis*. I should not care so much for him had not my good sister-in-law and my pretty niece joined his party. In short, they turned me out, with orders not to come again without bringing you in my hand. I have hunted for you ever since in vain; but now that I have luckily found you, you will not refuse to return with me to dinner."

George would have excused himself.

"He had only come," he said, "for a very short time, on business, which was nearly finished; he was about to depart, and he had not a moment for any thing but business."

"Even if you go to-morrow, you must dine somewhere to day—and why not as well at my brother's as your inn."

With these words he put his hand under the young man's arm, and drew him along heedless to all excuse.

It has been said that a good face is the best letter of recommendation; and no one ever had a better than George. The banker and his family were charmed with him; each praised him in the way. Mr. Stendhal admired his open countenance; his wife, the modest propriety of his manners; her mother, who was very old, and rather deaf, the good natured and respectable way in which he answered several questions that she put to him. The daughter, a blooming girl of sixteen, said nothing; but perhaps the look of pleasure with which she listened to the praises bestowed by the rest of the family; was not the least eloquent part of the panegyric.

In the course of the evening, Mr. Stendhal learned that his guest's name was George, that he was an orphan, and that he would leave Marseilles in five or six days. He mentioned also the names of some of the merchants with whom he had business; and one of them happening to be a particular friend of Stendhal's the good banker went to him the next day, to make inquiries respecting his new acquaintance.

"All I know about him," said the merchant "is, that he comes from an old correspondent of mine, who has recommended him very strongly to me. He has transacted business for that gentleman, with several others besides myself, and he is generally regarded as a clever

or intelligent young man. My friend lamented in his letter, that he had not the power to offer him a permanent situation, and he asked me to look out for one for him, but I have not met with any thing likely to suit."

This was enough for Stendhal, who was a sort of benevolent Quixotte in his way. He wished to serve George; but, with the delicacy of true generosity, he desired that the young man should feel himself the obliger, rather than the obliged. He told him that he wanted a clerk; George fell into the innocent snare laid for him; he offered himself, and was immediately accepted.

Mr. Stendhal was very well satisfied with the abilities of his new clerk, and not less so with his conduct; the only thing that he wished was, to see in the young man more of the gaiety natural in his time of life; but he was constantly serious, and even sad, notwithstanding that his temper was so sweet, and his manners so mild and amiable, that he was a favorite with the whole family.

Two years passed away, and, at the end of that time, George was become what Mr. Stendhal emphatically called, his, "right hand;" he relieved the good banker from a great fatigue which he had until then taken upon himself; and while he never relaxed, in the slightest degree, his attention to business, he found time to render himself as agreeable and useful to the female part of the family, as to the master of it. He was Leocadia's language master, to the great satisfaction of Mrs. Stendhal, who had no longer any reason to reproach the girl with that disinclination to study which had been her only fault. But what perhaps drew the hearts of both mother and daughter still more strongly towards him was, his unwearied attention to the good grand-mother, who was alike loved and venerated by the whole family.

All at once Stendhal perceived that his wife appeared unusually serious and abstracted. It was evident that she had something on her mind; but what could that something be, which she concealed from a husband with whom, till then, she had no reserves? After puzzling his brain for a little time in vain conjectures, the banker took what we consider to be the only right way in these cases—he determined to come to the point at once.

"Till now," said he, "we have been happy, it is evident that you have ceased to be so: tell me the cause of your uneasiness; and if it is in my power to banish it, regard the thing as done."

"Then it is done," cried Mrs. Stendhal, embracing him. "My uneasiness arose from discovering that Leocadia is in love."

"In love! with whom?"

"With George."

"So much the better, if he loves her."

"If, Mr. Stendhal?"

"If, Madame Stendhal—I say if——"

"And I say there is no if in the case: the poor fellow is too honorable to say a word; but I see clearly that he is dying for her."

"Ah my dear, mother's eyes are not always

to be trusted on the occasion: but I will speak to him myself."

And, without any preface, he said to the young man, the following day, "George, it is time for you to be looking out a wife; what do you think of my daughter?"

George had no need to reply; his countenance told Mr. Stendhal plainly that his wife was in the right.

"Well, well," cried he, in a tone of pleasure, "you love her, hey?"

"It is true, sir; but Heaven is my witness I have never dared to breathe a syllable——"

"Ah you were right not to speak to her, but why did you not tell me your mind? You know that I despise the pride of birth, and that I don't care for money. All that I desire is, that my son-in-law should be a man of probity, and descended from an honest family."

It is impossible to describe the mingled expressions of grief and shame which appeared in the countenance of George when he heard these words. He was silent for a moment: at last he said, in a voice of great emotion, "You are right, I never thought, I hoped it could be otherwise. Hitherto I have concealed from you who I am: to-morrow you shall know all. Leave me now, I beseech you."

[To be continued.]

FROM THE INTELLIGENCER AND CHRONICLE. WHAT IS THE DESIGN OF CREATION.

What must have been the proceedings of heaven on that wonderful morn when nature with all her worlds awoke from the dark bosom of chaos; what natural, or miraculous agency must have been excited by the Almighty to rouse them into existence, and impress upon them beauty, loveliness and motion, is beyond the conception of man. There is an invisible power that maintains the order and harmony of the universe. But by what miraculous interposition was it first awakened into existence, or in what dark bed it slept before it was called forth, or what its original substance was,—these are inquiries that baffle and elude the most subtle investigation. One thing is certain. Matter has no self-moving powers to put itself into motion. Therefore to have weighed these vast worlds, and hung them on imperishable chains, must have required a power commensurate to so vast a work. That power is God, and that God how great! Here is the first cause, and before it let *Atheism* with all its ill-boasted reason fall prostrate, and acknowledge its nothingness.

It is not fiction. Deity arose in his omnipotence and with a single impulse of divine energy broke the dead silence of chaotic night, and from its dread abyss launched these worlds into oceans of day. Millions on millions of worlds without end, being furnished and stationed in order, the great I AM arose from the central throne of glory, and with one word of command, bade the inconceivable vast ENIGMA move: and all heaven's bright legions shouted acclamations of glory.—"The morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

To what end is this world, and for what purpose are its inhabitants, made? Before creation there could have been no misery. Has the Almighty broken the balmy repose of peace in eternity by ordering the plan of creation in such a manner, as shall eventually introduce the most substantial and inconceivable misery, that dependant beings are capable of enduring, or infinite vengeance capable of inflicting? Justice spurns the unhalloved thought with indignation. Such a charge is casting a blot of the broadest infamy and ingratitude on his ever blessed character. Angels, these bright sons of the morning, instead of shouting for joy, would have wept in view of such an end.

The question returns:—what was the original design of the Almighty in the production of intelligent beings? Let the scriptures answer. "For thy pleasure they are and were created." It is according to the good pleasure of his will that all men should be gathered in one in Christ. The result therefore will be (Psalms lxxxvi 9,) that "All nations whom thou has made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." He never could have created but to bless. In view of this, well might all the sons of God shout for joy.

The doctrine of universal salvation is worthy the exalted interest and glory that enkindled in the bosom of angels, when its heaven-born tidings were shouted to earth; and it is as like glorious to the fondest hopes of men. That midnight hour was luminous and sublime as the morning of creation. It was the golden moment when the mysterious design of creation "that had been kept secret from the beginning," was announced to man. The heavens were wrapt in beams of glory, while shepherds on the plains of Judea were lost in wonder and amazement. The dead silence of night was broken by the voice of immortals and the glad tidings of great joy sweetly rolled through the air, and burst upon the world in double sounds of glory. The exhibition how grand! Hark! "O how charming is the radiant band of music playing through the air; angelic armies tune their harps." Their errand is done. Behold them rising! Hark! hear them shouting; "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will towards men."

Reader, pause;—and let this last sentence have its weight on your mind, and the design of creation is indisputably plain. It is universal happiness.

INTERESTING VIEWS OF CHRISTIANITY. NO. 12.

If I am sufficiently convinced of the authenticity of this deposition, which is the grand object of my enquiries; if I am morally certain, that it has been neither fabricated, nor essentially altered; can I reasonably doubt of its truth? I have already said, that the truth of a history is its conformity with the facts.—If I am satisfied, that the miraculous facts con-

tained in that they nor adm if it like public could such fac on con some lo maxims Here self to n might co ing the of the w on th were no especial could n respect witness the, wh govern interest question read the power, pose th historic then al doctrin If the times migton erent; past o "I have by a pa dom, th him o know fact an that tin oracles was to I, the ed des find th tem an as was parts of which contain pointed manner charac like positive I co print what the fa do I e for dis this or plente "H reat o

ained in the deposition are of such a nature, that they could have been neither fabricated, nor admitted to be true, had they been false; if it likewise appeared, that the witnesses, who publicly and unanimously attested those facts, could neither deceive or be deceived as to such facts; can I reject their deposition without counteracting, not merely all the rules of sound logic, but the most commonly received maxims of human conduct?

Here a very striking reflection suggests itself to my mind: though it were possible I might conceive some reasonable doubt respecting the authenticity of the historical writings of the witnesses, and might found those doubts upon this circumstance, that those writings were not addressed to any particular society, especially charged to preserve them; yet I could not reasonably form the smallest doubt respecting those epistles, addressed by the witnesses to particular and numerous societies, which they themselves had founded and governed. How much were those societies interested in the careful preservation of those epistles of their own founders! I, therefore, read those epistles with all the attention in my power, and I see that they every where suppose the miraculous facts, contained in the historical writings, and frequently refer to them as the immovable basis of belief, and of doctrine.

If the Lawgiver of nature had, at sundry times, and in divers manners, announced the mission of the Messenger, long before the event; this would undoubtedly be a striking proof of the truth of that mission.

The proof would be still more striking, if by a particular dispensation of Supreme Wisdom, the oracles, of which I am speaking, had been consigned to the very adversaries of the Messenger, and of his ministers; and if those factious and most obstinate adversaries had until that time, constantly professed to apply those oracles to the Messenger, or Messiah, who was to come.

I therefore, open that book, which the literal descendants of those very men, who crucified the Messenger, and persecuted his ministers and first followers, present to me this day, as authentic and divine. I run over several parts of this book and meet with a writing which throws me into the most profound astonishment. I think I am reading an anticipated and circumstantial history of the Messenger: I discover in it all his features, his character, and the principal particulars of his life. In a word, I seem to be reading the deposition of the witnesses.

I cannot withdraw my eyes from this surprising picture; what strokes! what colours! what expression! what correspondence with the facts! how natural the emblems! What do I say! it is not an emblematical picture of far distant futurity, it is a faithful representation of the present; and that which is not, is painted as though it were.

He grew up as a tender plant; and as a root out of dry ground; he had no form nor

comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him."

"He is despised and rejected of men: a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from him: he was despised, and we esteemed him not."

"He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed."

As it may be interesting to most of our readers to hear both sides of the controversy relative to the rejection of the Witnesses by Judge Story, we have thought it advisable to insert Mr. Cowell's Reply, together with Mr. Pickering's answer, which appeared in the Providence Patriot, of the 5th and 12th inst.

MR. COWELL'S REPLY TO REV. DAVID PICKERING.

SIR—I have read, with the most careful attention, the second edition of your argument in the Telescope of the first instant, and the third in the Patriot of the same date, and truth compels me to say, that I can see no evidence of much improvement. So far as argument is concerned you have not advanced one step, though I am ready to admit that, in your third edition, you have infused a spirit which may interest the feelings of some, however it may affect their judgment; and this I confess I am not unwilling to see, though not unaccompanied with personal abuse, for, where there is no weight of thought, I like to see *pleasantry* and *good humor*, although, in the intellectual scale, this humor ascends not to the grade of wit. Indeed, in this I confess you have showed no little tact, for, finding yourself unable to overcome the doctrines I have advanced, you direct your whole force against me in *propria persona*. With regard to myself, I feel as I informed you, inadequate to contend with such a foe; but, as respects the legal doctrines I advanced, I feel doubly assured, that they have been too long settled to be overcome by you—and in every attack on them unless I am very much mistaken you will find yourself in the situation of the Unicorn in his royal contest with the Lion.

When you first addressed me as "Clerk of the Circuit Court" through the medium of the Telescope I could not but feel, highly flattered, with the attention—Indeed I felt under deep obligation, that one so "learned in law" should voluntarily undertake to instruct me not only in that knowledge necessary in my profession as a lawyer, but in my faith as a Christian. I thought at that time, the Rev. Editor felt a regard for me particularly though only known to him by reputation by the official station I held. In this however, I am convinced I erred. I think now that not only my own improvement and that of the Judges of the Circuit Courts, but that of the citizens of R. Island, generally, was intended. It would now seem that all were to be enlightened in matters of law and religion, by his learned lucubrations, for I can see no justifiable reason for a second and third edition of the same thing, especially after my distinct and un-

qualified avowal of my "faith," and of my legal opinions as a lawyer, not one of which has yet been answered.

I am willing, Sir, to admit the whole force of the argument you think you derive from the authority of Blackstone, to which you have referred me. It does not in the least militate with any of the positions I assumed; on the contrary it affirms them. Blackstone says—"All witnesses, of whatever religion or country that have the use of their reason, are to be received and examined, except such as are infamous, or such as are interested in the event of the cause." This, Sir, is precisely my ground. I observed in my Card that a Mahometan or Pagan could be sworn according to the form of taking oaths of their respective countries. All I contended for was, that a witness must be sworn by what he *believes* in, for this *belief* is the very *soul* of the oath, if I may be allowed such an expression. And pray Sir, of what "religion" is the Atheist? and what constitutes his religious belief? Is he a Christian, and, therefore, to be sworn upon the Christian's oath? This you acknowledge would be an "absurdity," and yet you say he can "affirm." If this is not the greater absurdity of two, there is no absurdity in the "Vedas," which you seem so piously willing should be "faithfully believed" by me. What constitutes the doctrine of the "affirmation" will be considered in its place. I wish now further to consider the oath.

In a note appended to this very authority of Blackstone, I find the same construction given to the oath as was given by me in my Card. The note is in these words—"A Mahometan may be sworn upon the Alcoran, and Gentoo according to the custom of India." "But an Atheist, or a person who has no belief or notion of God, or a future state of rewards and punishments, ought not in any instance to be admitted as a witness." And this, Sir, has been the interpretation given to the oath for a number of centuries, in all Christian countries, and I defy you to produce a single instance to the contrary of any legal decision of a competent Court in this country except in one instance, where an exception was taken to disbelief in future rewards and punishments only, where it was decided that the objection should go rather to the credibility than to the competency. Since, Sir, you have referred me to one authority, of "transatlantic origin," I will refer you to a number. I forebore to do this in my Card, because I thought it unnecessary to travel out of our own country to show what was understood by an oath.

In the great and leading cause of *Omychund vs. Barker*, decided in 1739, in the High Court of Chancery, in England, (reported in Atkyns, vol. 1, page 21,) the legal doctrine of the oath was most elaborately and learnedly gone into. The great question was whether the depositions of witnesses, of the Gentoo religion, sworn to according to the ceremony or form of swearing, ought to be admitted as legal evidence. The facts were

that one Barker, an English merchant, had left Calcutta greatly in debt, for merchandize previously bought. He embarked, but died on the voyage. He, however, made a will, charging his real and personal estate with the payment of his just debts. A bill was filed to recover this debt, and the depositions of two Gentoo, Ramkissenseat and Ramchunecooberage, were produced and certified to have been sworn to according to the form of swearing in that country, to prove the debt. An objection was taken to this, as illegal testimony, it not having been sworn to in a legal manner; and this objection brought up the whole doctrine of oaths. It was decided by the Court that the evidence was legal, inasmuch as it was sworn to according to the Gentoo form. It was upon the authority of this case that Blackstone, more than twenty years afterwards, advanced the doctrine in his "Commentaries," that "all witnesses, of whatever religion or country," ought to be admitted; and it was upon the authority of this case that I observed to you, in my Card, that a Mahometan or Pagan could be a witness, they being sworn according to what they believed in—for this belief constitutes the efficacy of the oath. The form of the oath, say the Court in the above case, "varies in countries according to different laws, but the substance is the same in all." But while Chief Justice Willes admits that Turks, Pagans, &c. are legal witnesses, he says, in so many words, "I am clearly of the opinion, that if they (Infidels) do not believe in God, or future rewards and punishments, they ought not to be admitted." And will it be pretended that less is required of Christians? I think not. "An oath," says Chief Justice Lee, "is a religious sanction that mankind have universally established."—If it were possible to form an oath by which an Atheist would be bound in conscience, I will not say that he ought not to be admitted as a witness. But until this is done no statute in Rhode-Island will allow him to be sworn; and as the legal form of the oath in R. Island is the Christian's oath, and as that oath, in addition to a belief in the existence of a God, points to a world to come, it is equally idle to administer it to one who has no such belief. The case in Atkyns' overruled the illiberal doctrine of Lord Coke, that none but Christians could be legal witnesses. The Court said, referring to another case cited, that the "necessity of trade had mollified the rigorous rules of the old law."

I could Sir refer to a number of authorities of "transatlantic origin," which go the whole length of the preceding case. Phillips, a very correct elementary writer, is very full upon the subject, so is Starkie indeed there is no decision, or authority to the contrary—nor are any of these authorities contradicted by Blackstone. This Commentator means what he says and no more—he says "all witnesses of whatever religion or country" are to be examined and who, pray denies this.—This is the very doctrine for which I contended.—I con-

tended that men of all religions have a right to be sworn in some form or other where the oath is binding on the conscience. But I denied that all men can be sworn by this Christian's God—None can be sworn by this God but they, who believe, in judgments. There is another English authority which is deemed of importance, I allude to Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy—"oaths" says he "are nugatory, i. e. carry with them no proper force or obligation unless we believe that God will punish false swearing with more severity than a simple lie or breach of promise." I could quote Dr. Tillotson on the same point, but sufficient has been said of foreigners, which I should not have named at all, had you not referred me to one yourself.

I will now return from my "trans-atlantic" excursion to which you invited me, and will once more look into the authorities of my own country, although I shall cross the water again when I consider your views of the "affirmation."

I am "not aware" Sir, that the case I cited from Johnson's Reports, "is the opinion of a solitary Jurist, in the State of N. York, whose opinion is opposed by that of legal characters by no means inferior to him in judgement," I know to the contrary—I know it to have been the unanimous opinion of the whole Court—I know also, it has been generally approved, not only in that, but in other States, you are mistaken in regard to this fact, Sir, full as much as you are, when you say, you read this opinion "ten years since"—for this opinion happened to have been delivered in 1820, at the May term of the Court—and you must have had a wonderful prescience to have known and read it three years before it was pronounced!—That opinion, give me leave to tell you, meets the approbation of the soundest part of the Bar throughout the U. States, not excepting the Bar of R. Island. But that opinion is not a "solitary" one upon this question in this country. In the case of Curtis vs. Strong, (reported in 4th of Day page 51) the same principle is expressly decided by the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut. Upon the Case of Curtis vs. Strong, Judge Swift remarks:

"The case of Curtis against Strong was a contest between the heir at law, and the devisee under a will, in which the heir at law alleged, that the will was not duly executed, because one of the subscribing witnesses did not believe in the obligation of an oath. It was found, that the witness did not believe in the obligation of an oath, a future state of rewards and punishments, or accountability after death, either at the time of the attestation, or the probate of the will. The Court therefore decided that the witness was incompetent, and the will not duly executed."

In this case it was also decided, that proof of what the person objected to as a witness had said was proper to be admitted; for the belief and opinion of men can be known only by what they have said or written; their

declarations, either verbal or written, are therefore, the proper evidence of their opinions, and are not to be considered in the light of hearsay evidence, but as facts.

It was also decided that the person objected to might not be sworn for the purpose of declaring his belief of the obligation of an oath, and to contradict or explain what witnesses had sworn against them: for it would be a manifest absurdity to administer an oath to a man, who denied its obligation.

On the same principle, a witness, when sworn, may not be compelled to answer, or even be questioned as to the belief on this subject, for it is inconsistent to call upon a person under oath to acknowledge or disclose facts, which show he denies the obligation of an oath: as he must be under the strongest possible inducement to answer in such manner as will not disqualify him, whatever may be his opinions; but if a case can be supposed where a man has such a sense of the moral obligation to speak the truth at all times, that he will from regard to it, acknowledge that he disbelieves the religious obligation of an oath, he would by that circumstance be entitled to credit; and the consequence of this mode of inquiry would be, where it had any effect, that the most unprincipled men, who ought not to be credited, would never be excluded by it; and that none but those would be excluded who had such a high sense of the moral obligation to speak the truth, that they might safely be relied on."

The same grand principle, has also been decided by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and that too within a year past. All three learned tribunals have solemnly decided that witness is not to be sworn unless he believes not only in the existence of a God, but "in accountability after death," and for myself I think they are entitled to as much respect as the dicta of the Rev. David Pickering, Pastor of the Universalist Church in Providence.

But Sir I contend that even in Rhode Island the Christian's oath points "to the world to come" even as it has been interpreted by our own Jurists.—The Chief Justice in a charge to the Grand Jury says, "However some may consider this part of the oath, it is equally obligatory to every other part, a violation of it may subject you here to fine and imprisonment at least if nothing more, and hereafter to that awful responsibility, to which every man subjects himself, who to a solemn assertion adds the religious sanction—So help me God." Who will say after this that the Christian's oath even in Rhode-Island does not recognize the doctrine of future accountability after death? What is here pronounced to be the theory of the oath in Rhode-Island, the Circuit Court only reduced to practice; they excluded two witnesses, who disbelieved in this "hereafter"—and let it be remembered that the U. S. Circuit Courts are in some measure bound by the interpretations given to the law, by the highest tribunals of justice in the several States, and if so, they were

bound by the interpretation of the Christian's oath in this State, and Sir, I will add that I have too much confidence in the integrity and ability of our Supreme Court, to admit the thought for a moment, that they will practice differently from what they preach. What now becomes of your vain and pompous declaration inflated with so much intellectual gas, that Judge Story had pronounced "sentence directly in the face of the law," who, it is generally agreed did not touch what you consider the most objectionable part of the doctrine.

I will now turn my attention to another absurdity which you have thought proper to have printed, and I shall have done: I will quote the precious morsel entire—"An Atheist cannot swear by the Deity, because he does not believe in his existence, yet he may affirm and his evidence be appreciated according to his weight of character for truth and veracity!" In other words, an Atheist is not competent according to his weight of character under affirmation! No doubt after such a specimen of logic, as this, you can prove your religious creed to be true, from the Bible—No wonder after such a specimen of legal knowledge, you are such a star in theology. But, Sir, let us turn to the Bible, and see how your Atheistical evidence would be considered in the Court of Solomon. If Sir, you read the same translation of the Bible that I do—I mean the translation of the *old* Testament—the translation of the *new* I know you do not, or at least I have been informed that the new Testament has been translated, expressly for the use of the denomination of Christians to which you belong in the 18th chapter of Proverbs 5th verse, you will thus find it written, "It is not good to accept the person of the wicked to overthrow the righteous in judgement" and yet, Sir, you are willing to accept the testimony of an Atheist, for judgement, in the Courts of R. Island—nay, contend he cannot be excluded under an affirmation! Pray, what is an affirmation! is it less binding than an oath? I never understood it so. The Friends or Quakers do not consider it so. The affirmation with them is based upon the same religious sanction that the oath is—and they subject themselves to the same penalties *moral* as well as *penal*, for false affirmation, as they do, who take the oath.—The reason why Quakers affirm is, not because of disbelief in future accountability—but because they think they are forbidden to swear by their Lord and Master, indeed so great is their reverence to Deity, that they scruple to speak his name in secular affairs, hence the affirmation is adopted by themselves, to meet the exigencies of their case. This is what I have always understood, and what one of the most intelligent of that sect has informed me is their view of the affirmation.—But I do not wish you to take this exposition from me as you seem not to have a favorable idea of my legal knowledge.—I will therefore refer to Lord Mansfield:—In the case *Atcheson vs Everitt*, reported by Cowper his Lordship held the following language.

"A more liberal way of thinking prevailed

after the revolution. The principles of toleration were explained and justified in consequence of the writings of Mr. Locke, Lord Somers, and other great men of those times; and a statute passed, which though not general, was very extensive in the relief it afforded to scrupulous consciences. The statute was 1 Wm. & Mar. c. 18. commonly called the Toleration Act."

"This statute was followed about six years after by another statute 7 & 8 Wm. 3. c. 34. which allows a Quaker to affirm in cases, where other persons are required to take an oath." "It is objected, that the Quakers are the only people in the world who ever refused to swear; but in substance their affirmation is the same thing: The form only is different; for an affirmation is a most solemn appeal and attestation to God of the truth."

Now, Sir, allowing Lord Mansfield to have been correct, what becomes of your *atheistical affirmation*, which you contend is legal. But, Sir, I do not blame you for lugging atheism into our Courts, for you must go this whole length, otherwise your conclusion would contradict your premises. You must prove that Atheists are entitled to be witnesses, under the act of "religious freedom," or you prove nothing at all. You are the first person that ever placed the affirmation of Atheists on the same legal ground with that of the Quakers; and for the sake of supporting an argument which has no foundation in law or fact you have stigmatized one of the most respectable classes in society.—The credit of this exclusively belongs to you. I do not believe there is a judge or lawyer, or another Divine, besides yourself, in the United States or any other well informed citizen, that would dare to maintain such doctrine; a doctrine which, if promulgated, even on the banks of the Ganges, would make a Bramin blush! For the well informed, among Gentoos, believe in an overruling Providence, in this and the future state, if what was certified to Lord Chancellor Hardwick was correct in the case *Omychund vs. Barker* before mentioned; and how vastly superior is this belief to the chilling and desolating principles of atheism.

Upon the question whether the competency of a witness is effected by the act concerning "religious freedom," I say, as I said to you before, I will not waste a moment's time. Although this question has gone through three editions with you, with many corrections and additions, it remains in my mind too plain for argument; and I have no hesitation in saying, that the decision of the Circuit Court was no more a violation of this act, than it was of the charter of the Merchants Bank—and I will say further, that I do not believe there is a Lawyer in Providence, who has the reputation of being a sound Lawyer, that would risk his reputation in saying it had, before that, or any other learned tribunal of justice, except it became his professional duty so to do. You are mistaken in regard to the opinion of the sound part of the Bar upon this point.

I am, with respect, your ob't servant,
BENJ. COWELL.

Mr. Cowell tenders his respects to Mr. Pickering, and informs him, if he is a stickler for the honor of having the last word he will be sure to have it, if, to the preceding, he makes any reply. Mr. Cowell is willing to acknowledge he feels a deep interest in the discussion; not, however, on account of the petty personalities that have taken place, nor yet much on account of the gross attack on the Circuit Court—but altogether on account of that grand RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE which our forefathers have joined in political wedlock to the oath and affirmation. On this principle, if dispassionately analyzed, will be found to rest, as Judge Spencer very properly observes, "all our institutions."

LIFE—AN EXTRACT.

Life is a fountain fed by a thousand streams that perishes if one be dried. It is a silver cord twisted with a thousand strings that parts assunder if one be broken. Frail and thoughtless mortals are surrounded by innumerable changes which makes it much more strange that they escape so long, that they almost all perish suddenly at last. We are encompassed with accidents ever ready to crush the mouldering tenement that we inhabit. The seeds of disease are planted in our constitution by the hand of nature. The earth and the atmosphere, whence we draw our life, are impregnated with death—health is made to operate its own destruction—the food that nourishes the body contains the elements of its decay—the soul that animates it by a vivifying fire, tends to wear it out by its actions—death lurks in ambush about all our paths.

Notwithstanding this is the truth so palpable, and confirmed by daily examples before our eyes, how little do we lay it to heart!—We see our friends and neighbors perishing around us, but how seldom does it occur to our thoughts, that our knell, shall give the next fruitless warning to the world!

LITERATURE

Is a ray of that wisdom which pervades the universe. Like the sun, it enlightens, rejoices, and warms. By the aid of books we collect around us all things, all places, men and times. By them we are recalled to the duties of human life. By the sacred examples of greatness, our passions are diverted and we are roused to virtue. Literature is the daughter of heaven; who has descended upon earth to soften the evils of life. Have recourse then to books. The sages who have written long before our days, are so many travellers in the paths of calamity, who stretch out their friendly hands, inviting us when abandoned by the world, to join their society.

Wealth without friends, is like life without health; the one an uncomfortable fortune, and the other a miserable being. Without friends, this world is but a wilderness.

Flatter not yourself of your faith to God, if you want charity for your neighbour.

CURIOUS PUNISHMENTS.

The following collection of a few of the many curious punishments inflicted for various offences, is copied from the old records of Massachusetts, between the years 1630 and 1650.

"Sir Richard Saltonstall, fined four bushels of malt for his absence from court.

"Josias Plastow shall, for stealing four baskets of corn from the Indians, return them eight baskets again, be fined 5*l*. and hereafter be called Josias, and not Mr. as he used to be.

"Joyce Bradwood shall give unto Alexander Beeks, 20*s*. for promising him marriage, without her friends consent, and now refusing to perform the same.

"Thomas Petre, for suspicion of slander, idleness, and stubbornness, is to be severely whipped, and kept in hold.

"Richard Turner, for being notorious drunk, was fined 2*l*.

"Edward Palmer, for extortion, taking 33*s* 7*d*. for the plank of Boston stocks, is fined 5*l*. and censured, to be set one hour in the stocks.

"John White is bound in 10*l*. to be of good behaviour, and not to come into the company of his neighbor — alone."

BEAUTY.

Socrates called it a shortlived tyrant; Plato, the privilege of nature; Aristotle, one of the most precious gifts of nature; Theophrastus, a mute eloquence; Diogenes, the most forcible letter of recommendation; Carneades, a queen without soldiers; Theocritus, a serpent covered with flowers; Bion, a good that does not belong to the possessor, because it is impossible to give one's self beauty, or to preserve it.

A MONSTER.

Died at Paris, France, in August last, a poor rag gatherer, (*chiffonnier*) who possessed nothing but a few worm eaten pieces of furniture. He had a niece, who attended him in his last moments, not even expecting that his property would pay for his burial. He had loved his cat very much, and when it died of old age, he had stuffed and placed it on the top of his bed. The niece thought she would preserve it as a memorial, and calling in the owner of the house as a witness, when she began to make an inventory of the wretched furniture of the deceased, the cat was lifted down from its high place. Its weight surprised them, and they hastened to open it, when lo! there came out several rolls of gold. The money was counted, and found to amount to a sum of 10,000 francs (about 712*l*)! Then was the piety of the poor girl rewarded. She is now rich and owes her happiness to an old rag gatherer, who suffered and fasted all his life to amass this treasure.

Yesterday (says a Fredericksburg paper of Oct.) a shoemaker was arraigned in this county for stabbing, cutting, &c. one Thomas Sole-leather, and was defended by his counsel on the ground that there was no law to prevent a shoemaker from cutting sole-leather.

If it be necessary for every man to be more acquainted with his contemporaries than with past generations, and to rather know the events which may immediately affect his fortune or quiet, than the revolutions of ancient kingdoms, in which he has neither possessions nor expectations; if it be pleasing to hear of the preferment and dismissal of statesmen, the birth of heirs and the marriage of beauties, let the humble author of journals and gazettes be considered as a liberal dispenser of beneficial knowledge.

We may fall under the character of tail bearer for telling truths, when it is not necessary that they should be told; for truth ought not to be told at all times.

A person who can live in this world without being slandered, must be too stupid or insignificant to claim attention.

When Ramsay was one day complimenting Newton on the new lights which he had thrown upon science, he made the following splendid answer: "Alas! I am only like a child picking up pebbles on the great ocean of truth."

When Paddy Blake heard an English gentleman speaking of a fine echo at the lake of Killarney, which repeats the sound forty times, he very promptly observed—"Faith, that's nothing at all to the echo in my father's garden in the county of Galway; if you say to it, "*How do you, Paddy Blake?*" it will answer, "*Pretty well, I thank you Sir!*"

Telescope and Miscellany.

"Earnestly contend for the faith."

PROVIDENCE, SATURDAY, DEC. 29, 1827.

FOR THE TELESCOPE AND MISCELLANY.

Mr. Editor—I was not a little pleased with an article in the 15th No. of your paper headed with the question—"What do you know about it?"

As you have declared in your letter to Mr. Cowell, your belief in future punishment (by which I suppose you mean punishment in a future world)—you will not deem it unkind if I put to you uncle Josey's question, and ask you "What do you know about it?" Much has been said and much has been written about future punishment, but one question ought to be settled, what do those who believe, write and preach this doctrine, "know about it?"

"Would it not be of vast importance in society, if every man would think of this question?" "Uncle Josey's plan was to take nothing, for which the retailer would not consent to be responsible." Will the "retailers" of the doctrine of future punishment, be responsible for its truth? They will if they know it to be true. The Christian community do not wish to know what preachers think and believe about future punishment, but the only ques-

tion which will settle the matter with them is—Preachers, "What do you know about it?" "How much scandal would be saved, how many dark surmises; how many unkind suspicions would be choked in their births," if this question was duly attended to. Mr. Editor, if you will attend to this question in behalf of your brethren and yourself, you will confer a favour upon one who wishes to practice according to the maxim given by
UNCLE JOSEY.

REMARKS

The well known hand of "Uncle Josey," awakes a variety of reflections which we had hoped would be left to slumber in forgetfulness. But since he chose to take a stand which was not anticipated, we must meet him upon his own ground, and offer him the dish with which he has attempted to tempt our appetite.

We have truly declared in our letter to Mr. Cowell, our belief in future punishment: Our careful Uncle inquires, "What do you know about it?" We answer—we know that we believe what we have declared. Let us ask in our turn, what does this good and careful Uncle believe? Although he does not furnish a direct answer, he clearly furnishes a direct inference; and that inference is, he believes nothing except what he knows to be true.

We will now ask him a few questions.

What do you know about the existence of a God, or his perfections? The inquiry is not, what ministers or Uncles believe; but what do you know?

What do you know about the creation of the world or its overthrow by the flood? What do you know about the bare existence of Noah and his sons, the Patriarchs, Moses or the Prophets? Do you know that such men ever existed? What do you know about Christ or his doctrine? Do you know that such a man ever existed, or that he proclaimed any such doctrine as the New Testament contains? What do you know about the founding of Babylon, Tyre and Rome? Do you know that any such places ever existed upon the earth? What do you know about the discovery of this Continent by Christopher Columbus, or its early settlement by Europeans? Do you know that such places exist, as London, Liverpool, Paris, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Pekin or Calcutta? Do you know that there is such a place as Quebec? Do you know that the independence of the United States was declared, July 4th, 1776? Do you know that you was ever born, or that you did not spring up like a mushroom from the earth? We do not ask you what you believe, but what you know? As you seem indisposed to ask or receive evidence, we should be ungenerous to demand any evidence of you; but what do you know? What do you know about a future state of existence? Do not attempt to retail your speculations to any one, unless you know something about the fact; for this would be removing your own foundation and rendering yourself ridiculous. If you are a MINISTER,

be careful to entertain your hearers with your childish sports, and what you have experienced in riper years, but avoid both the prophecies and history of the Old and New Testament, lest you depart from what you know!

By these few examples, it is hoped you may be able to comprehend and know the absurdity of your communication, and thus avoid a further exposure.

We will now pass to inform you of what we know. We know that for eight years past our sentiments respecting punishment have been the same as they now are: That the positive rewards of virtue and vice are confined to this world, but that the negative or consequential effects of virtue and vice will continue until the general resurrection to immortality: This latter sentiment, we call punishment, in its negative form: This also is what we meant by punishment in the future state, in our reply to Mr. Cowell; and which our careful Uncle might have read in the first vol. of the Christian Telescope.

We know that your premises are of just the same description as have been often urged by the most unqualified sceptics with whom we have ever been acquainted, and that if they are traced into all their legitimate consequences, will unavoidably land you in Atheism, if you are not already on that ground.

We know, that in case you furnish us with such unreasonable communications in future, they will receive no special notice; particularly, unless they come post-paid.

We know that it is useless for you to travel ten or twelve miles to deposit your communications in Quincy Post-Office, with the expectation of being unknown, or unrecognized, unless you can become a better counterfeiter of a strange hand. And we know, that in the words attributed to king Solomon, we read, "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he should be wise in his own conceit."

Permit us to ask our dear Uncle; did you not preach and advocate the doctrine of a future judgment and future punishment, not eighteen months since, in a neighbouring State? If so, please tell us what you know to the contrary at the present time. Editor.

FOR THE TELESCOPE AND MISCELLANY

"Evil communications corrupt good manners."

These are the words of an inspired penman, who knew, well, the truth and the weight of them. In order to come to a right conception of the meaning attached to them, we will notice, in the first place, the words, "evil communications." An evil communication is a discourse or conversation, that is bad, or baneful in its effects. Now, it is evident, that such a communication is likely to corrupt good manners or morals. That we may, however, have a clearer idea of the words above quoted, let us consider a few of the different kinds of evil communication, that are to be found in society. It is an evil communication, when a person goes into company and slanders others, that are absent, because it is productive of

many bad effects. It is also, an evil communication, when a person frequents, the society of gamblers, drunkards, thieves, &c. on account of the tendency, which it has, to render him of the like qualities with his associates.—Men, who have been of the highest rank in society, and notorious for their probity, and religion, have, by associating with immoral characters, become immoral and licentious themselves. Of this number less instances occur every day. It cannot, therefore, be too often inculcated that "evil communications corrupt good manners."

These things laid down, I come now to notice what meaning is attached to the terms "good manners." Generally speaking, good manners imply a behaviour, which is approved by the society, with which we live. But, in the words standing at the head of this article, they mean undoubtedly a conduct which is in accordance with the gospel of Christ.—Such a conduct as agrees with the injunction of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, is called good conduct. The apostle says, that evil communications corrupt this conduct! This is a certain truth. The gospel requires, of every man, that he love God, and his neighbour as himself. Now, if a person indulge himself in evil communications, he will neglect both of these important duties; and consequently his morals will be corrupted. If a man love God he will keep his commandments. If he love his neighbour, he will do him no injury, because these are both natural effects. But, if he indulge himself in evil communications, he can neither love God, nor his neighbours, and so cannot keep the commands of God nor refrain from the injury of his neighbour. From this it is evident, that "evil communications corrupt good manners."

J. F. M.

¶ We owe an apology to our readers for the small quantity of original matter in our present No. but trust that the advantage of having the whole of Mr. Cowell's reply in one paper, will be a sufficient excuse for the omission of other matter.

Poetry.

FOR THE TELESCOPE AND MISCELLANY,

WHEN LIFE IS FLED.

When flees this "vital spark" within,
That animates this feeble clay;
And soars aloft from stain of sin,
To launch into eternal day;

O then may all be calm around,
And gently close these nightless eyes,
With solemn peace each heart around,
Tho' the frail form now prostrate lies.

Calmly prepare the robe for death,
And hasten not the cold remains;
But slowly weave the cypress wreath,
Too soon the grave its victim claims.

The marble relic, let it stay
A few brief days in walls once dear;
Affection bid a short delay,
Perchance the shade will hover near;

And smile approval for the love

That gazed, caressed and tarried still,
The last embrace of love to give—
The last sad office to fulfil.

For I must wish for friends to weep,
Tho' not that hopeless tears should flow,
But like the mother when asleep
She views her babe that soothes her woe.

O then, may tears like these be mine,
That still the aching heart to rest,
And Hope its garland ever twine,
Around each brow, shine in each breast!
GERALDINE.

FOR THE TELESCOPE AND MISCELLANY.

THE RUINED TOWER.

I saw upon a lonely height,
The ruins of a beauteous tower;
Gloomy and dark in day's best light,
It bowed to Time's resistless power.
Yet still, around one turret flung,
That reared alone its head in air,
The mantling Ivy fondly clung,
And wreathed its sheltering foliage there.

And thus, I said, man's lot is cast—
The heart to ruin wastes a way;
And oft,—too oft—ere youth is past,
Finds nought is left it but decay.
Yet still there is a wreath divine,
Fate's darkest tempest cannot part,
That round the ruined form will twine,
And gently bind the broken heart.
December 24th, 1837. O. G. W.

FOR THE TELESCOPE AND MISCELLANY.

TO A FRIEND—ON "HOPE."

Light of the soul and of the heart,
Of man's elysian hour the beam,
"Unfading Hope," it is thy part
In life to gild our darkest dream.
Sweet is thy flattering smile to youth,
And dearer far than India's ore;
Eternal as the light of Truth,
Unto the breast all dark before.—
Grant, POWER OF LIGHT, its brightest ray
Enlighten in LOUISA'S mind;
Nor dim its beam when pleasure's day
In evening's darkness has declined.
And may her young and guileless heart
Ne'er feel the chilling touch of care
Or pain—but Fate and Fortune's art
Rule her lot fair, as she is fair.
The hand of Time shall pass the form,
Heaven made an image of her mind;
Until the soul, now bright and warm,
Part from the breast where it enshrined.

SELECTED FOR THE TELESCOPE AND MISCELLANY. BY EUGENIA.

REPUTATION.

Good name, in man or woman, is the jewel of their
Souls: Who steals my purse, steals trash, 'twas some-
thing,
Nothing, 'twas mine, 'tis his and has been slave to
thousands;
But he that filches me from my good name, robs me
of that which
Not enriches him, and makes me poor indeed.

NEW PAPER.

We have noticed with no small astonishment, proposals by F. C. Swain, for publishing a paper at Plymouth, Mass. to be entitled the "Spirit of the Pilgrims," of which he is to be the Editor.

From our knowledge of the man, we consider him, in every sense of the word, unqualified for the undertaking. We say thus much, because we do not wish to have the public imposed upon, by the attempts of those, whose capacity would not entitle them to a rank above the most common level, of those who make not the least pretensions to a knowledge of the English language.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The communications of "Charles Hudson" and "C. H." are received and shall have an immediate insertion. "R. C." "J. M." "J. F. M." "Guilelmus" and "Geraldine," are also on hand, and shall be inserted as convenience permits.

Married.

In this town, on Monday evening last, by the Rev. Mr. Crocker, Mr. John Hutchens, to Miss Sarah Packard Metcalf, only daughter of the late Nathaniel Metcalf, Esq. all of this town.

Long may connubial bliss divinely fair,
Beguide their cares, and crown domestic life;
Ye guardian angels smile upon this pair,
Sweet amity impart to husband and to wife.

On Tuesday evening last, by Rev. Mr. Pickering, Mr. James Gould, to Miss Mary Ann Springer, of this town.

On the 19th inst. Mr. Stephen A. Aplin Jr. to Miss Elizabeth Bosworth, all of this town.

On the 9th inst. Mr. Joshua Cambell, to Miss Mary Ormabee.

In Johnston, Mr. Seril E. Sweet, to Miss Ann Fowler, of Newport.

In Pawtucket, by Rev. Mr. Pease, Mr. Robert E. Lapham, to Miss Amelia Bray.

In Seekonk, Mr. Joel Whitaker, to Miss Almira Pitts.

In L. Compton, Mr. Robert Pierce, to Miss Mary A. Burgess.

In Newport, Mr. Nathaniel Greene, to Miss Mary Jane Moore.

In New-York, Mr. George N. Allen, formerly of this town, to Miss Ann Augusta Thornton.

Died.

In this town, Robey G. daughter of Mr. Joseph Burrows, aged 2 years.

On the 19th inst. Mrs. Sarah Franklin, aged 85.

On Wednesday morning, Mrs. Hannah Taylor, wife of Mr. George A. Taylor, and daughter of Olney Dyer, Esq. in her 24th year.

In Seekonk, Mrs. Abigail Melbury, wife of the late John Melbury, Esq. aged 67.

In Bristol, Mrs. Lydia Richmond, aged 56.

JUST PUBLISHED.

And for sale, at this office, Beauties of Divine Truth; a Sermon by ZELOTES FULLER, Minister of the Gospel. This work is well deserving the title given by the author. [F] Price, 12 1-2 cents.

PROPOSALS

FOR PUBLISHING IN PROVIDENCE, R. I. A LADIES' PAPER, TO BE ENTITLED

THE TOILET,

OR

LADIES' CABINET OF LITERATURE.

To be Edited by a Gentleman and Lady.

It is the intention of the Publisher to furnish, at a cheap rate, a choice and valuable selection of the best of such cotemporary writings, as will be adapted to the taste of those to whom it is dedicated, and to open a field for the cultivation of that native genius, which, unprovided with such an opportunity of exertion, might forever slumber in obscurity.

It will contain the same variety of amusement and instruction that is found in similar publications, such as the Philadelphia Album, New-York Mirror, and Boston Spectator.

The Publisher has procured a Gentleman and Lady, of acknowledged taste and talents, who will not fail in their endeavours to render it worthy of public patronage, and under these considerations he presents himself to the public, claiming no further encouragement than his undertaking—in the estimation of an enlightened community—may deserve.

CONDITIONS.

The Toilet, or Ladies' Cabinet of Literature, will be published every Saturday, commencing with the first Saturday in February next, if sufficient encouragement is given.

It will be printed on good paper, with new type, in quarto form of four pages to each number, with a complete index and title page at the close of the volume. It will be sent to subscribers at \$1 25 payable on the reception of the first number, \$1 50 at the expiration of six months, or \$1 75 at the close of the year. Those who may become responsible for four copies, may receive the fifth gratis.

All communications relative to the paper must be addressed, "Editors of the Toilet," &c. post-paid. [F] Subscription papers to be returned by the 25th of January.

JOSIAH SNOW.

* Editors who will insert the above prospectus in their papers will receive a copy by forwarding the same to us.

[F] Subscriptions received at this office. Also at the several Bookstores and Circulating Libraries. Providence, R. I. Dec. 27, 1837.

SAMUEL W. WHEELER,

Has for sale, at 110 1-2, Westminster-street,

The following Books, and Pamphlets.

The Christian Telescope, vols. 1 and 2 bound.

Ballou's Notes on the parables.

do. Letters to Walton and Buckminster.

do. Sermons on various subjects.

do. Chatechism, 4th Edition.

Balfour's, 1st and 2 Inquiry.

do. Reply to Sabine.

Kneeland and McCalla's controversy.

do. Translation of the New Testament.

do. Sermons on various subjects.

Pickering's Hymn Books in plain and ornamental binding.

do. Reply to Dr. Carpenter.

do. Sermons on various subjects.

Thompson's Christian Guide.

do. Lectures.

Life of Rev. John Murray.

Six Sermons, by an Episcopal Clergyman.

Canfield's Review of Hawes' Letters.

Light of Truth and Pleasure of Light.

Whittemore's Dialogue on 25th Chapter of Matthew.

do. Chatechism.

Hudsons' Letters to Rev. Mr. Ballou.

Sermons by Rev. Messrs Dean, Bisbe, Streeter and Fitz.

Many of the above will be sold very low.

CHRISTIAN VISITANT, NO. 5.

Just received at 110 1-2 Westminster-Street. Subscribers are requested to call for their copies. [F] A few copies for sale at 2 cts. each.

AGENTS.

The following gentlemen, are authorised and requested, to act as agents for the Telescope and Miscellany, and the Gospel Preacher: their receipt will be valid, for all money paid them on our account. [F] No persons, other than the following, are authorised to act in that capacity; nor will we hold ourselves accountable for money paid to any other.

RHODE ISLAND. Mr. Ephraim Miller, Pawtucket—Sabin Allen, Central-Falls—Joseph Jenks, Valley-Falls—Parker Borden, Esq. Bristol—Dys Child, Warren. Jonathan Wales, Woonsocket-Falls—Barthum Round, Slaterville—Ebenezer P. Sherman, Newport—John Burnham, Smithfield Bank.

MASSACHUSETTS. Rev. Paul Dean, Rev. Sebastian Stroeter, Boston.—Win. Brown, Esq. P. M. Plymouth.—John Maxim, Career.—Capt. Seth Allen, Halifax.—Josiah Perkins, Taunton.—C. H. Swansey.—Rev. R. L. Killam, A. Allen, Attleborough.—Pearley Hunt, Esq. Milford.—E. F. Ensign, P. M. Sheffield.—I. Benjamin, Esq. P. M. Egremont.—Rev. George Messenger, Great Barrington and Mount Washington.—Stephen Johnson, Fall-River.—Rev. L. Maynard, Medway.—Rev. Jacob West, Shrewsbury.—Charles Bradburne, Lovell.—Isaac Greene, Millville.—Daniel Howard, Easton.—Capt. Asa Pickering, Bellingham.—Worcester Carpenter, Seekonk.—P. Pickering and C. B. Snow, Blackman.—Simeon Wheelock, Mendon.—Jonathan Ann, West-Bridgewater.—Larned Scott, Uxbridge.—J. Darling, Douglas.

CONNECTICUT. George Spafford, Windham.—Jesse Spafford, Williamantic.—Rev. J. P. Farr, Stafford.—Dr. Daniel Hutchinson, Lebanon.—Russell Canfield, Hartford.—Levi Work, Eastford.—Hervy, Salisbury.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE. C. Benton, Esq. Lebanon.—Rev. Edward Turner, Portsmouth.—Samuel C. Stevens, Dover.—Timothy Pickering, Richmond.—Col. J. Warren, Newmarket.

MAINE. Rev. W. A. Drew, Gardiner.—Ed. Oakes, Observer, Norway.—Eli Gould, Portland.—Gasp. Bradburne, Saco.—Rev. A. Dinamore, Poland.—NEW-YORK. George M. Bourn, Ann Holden, Adin Ballou, New-York City.—Bookman Halsey, Balston-Spa.—Matthew M. Standlee, Plainville.—Rev. David Cooper, Saratoga-Springs.—Samuel Rogers, Ithaca.—Andrew Phares, Salina.—Chas. W. S. Syracuse.—Rev. W. I. Reese, West-Mendon.—Rev. N. Stacy, Hamilton.—Orrin Strong, Epsom.—Horace Richmond, Canadagua.—Horace Ball, Manchester.—Alfred Brush, Pine-Plains.—Thaddeus Loomis, Esq. P. M. Salisbury.

PENNSYLVANIA. Jason Wilson, Esq. Great Bend.—Rev. T. Fink, Philadelphia.

VERMONT. Rev. S. C. Loveland, Reading.—J. R. Bartlett, Hartland.—Rev. Ezekiel Voss, Washington.—James Fuller, Wardsboro.—Samuel Chablain Esq. Barton.—Asa Barton, Woodstock.

SOUTH-CAROLINA. B. F. Richardson, No. 272, King-st. Charleston.

OHIO. Editor of N. Reporter, Norwalk Huron Co. Wm. Jones Esq. Chillicothe.

[F] For Sale at this Office, A Series of Letters addressed to Rev. HENRY BALLOU, of Boston, being a vindication of the Doctrine of A FUTURE REBIRTH, against the principal arguments used by him, MR. BALFOUR, and others, by CHARLES HENRY, Pastor of a church in Westminster, Mass. Printed by D. Watson, Woodstock, Vt. 307 pages 8vo. Price \$1, bound and lettered.

NEW SUBSCRIBERS

CAN be accommodated with the back numbers of the present Volume, of this paper, in complete order by making immediate application to the Publisher.